

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 26 2006

Please type a plus sign (+) inside this box → ☐

PTO/SB/21 (08-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002: OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no person is required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	09/911,024	
	Filing Date	12 July 2001	
	First Named Inventor	S. REUNING	
	Group Art Unit	3625	
	Examiner Name	Oulette	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	5	Attorney Docket Number	Diedre

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form	<input type="checkbox"/> Assignment Papers (for an Application)	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply	<input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
<input type="checkbox"/> After Final	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition	<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information
<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter
<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer	
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement	<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund	
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application	Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT	
Firm or Individual name	Mark Pohl, Esq., USPTO Reg. No. 35,325 Pharmaceutical Patent Attorneys, LLC 55 Madison Avenue, 4th floor, Morristown, NJ 07960-7397 USA
Signature	/s/
Date	see below date

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231 on this date: <input type="text" value="see below date"/>	
Typed or printed name	
Signature	Date: 26 Dec 06

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

Post Available Copy

PTO/SB/97 (08-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0851-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number.

Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the
United States Patent and Trademark Office Central Fax Center
(571)273-8300

on 26 Dec 06
Date

/Mark Pohl/

Signature

J. Mark Pohl, Reg. No. 35,325

Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of transmission, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

The submitted papers are enumerated on the enclosed Transmittal Form,
PTO Form SB/21.

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.03 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

Fast Available Copy

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 26 2006

**In The United States Patent Office
Board Of Patent Appeals**

Ex parte Application of Stephen
Michael REUNING *et al.*,
Automated Prospector ...
Patent Application Serial No.
09/911,024

Appeal No. 2006-0580

REQUEST FOR REHEARING

This is a REQUEST FOR REHEARING pursuant to Rule 1.197(b). This is submitted within two months from the date of the original decision, and therefore is believed timely filed.

Applicant respectfully thanks the Board of Appeals for recognizing that claims 1 and 2 are allowable.

Claims 3 to 66 were rejected as obvious over MOSSBERG combined with HARTMAN and BOGURAEV or PEACH. The Board did not reverse this rejection because "the appellants have not presented any patentability arguments for these claims." *See Ex parte Reuning*, (Appeal No. 2006-0580) slip op. at 4 (Nov. 30, 2006). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration because the

Best Available Copy

appellants did in fact present both evidence and argument showing patentability of claims 3 to 66.

Appellant Has Presented
Evidence Showing That Claims
3 To 66 Are Non-Obvious

For example, these claims stand rejected as obvious over MOSSBERG. Several years before this appeal was filed, however, Appellant filed a RULE 131 DECLARATION antedating MOSSBERG. Appellant's APPEAL BRIEF explained how this evidence shows the patentability of claims 3 to 66. See APPEAL BRIEF (27 April 2004) at *e.g.* 6:9-12.

Similarly, Appellant's APPEAL BRIEF explained how the Examiner has already made an administrative agency fact-finding that the invention of claims 3 to 66 exhibits patentable synergy *vis* the prior art of record. See APPEAL BRIEF (27 April 2004) at *e.g.* 15:6-15.

Appellant Has Presented
Argument Explaining How Claims
3 To 66 Are Non-Obvious

Appellant presented argument explaining how the references fail to suggest the combination of claims 3 to 66, and indeed *teach away from* that combination. See APPEAL BRIEF (27 April 2004) at, *e.g.*, 13:3 to 15:5 (HARTMAN); 16:5-17 and 17:1 to 18:3 (BOGURAYEV); 18:5-18 (PEACH).

REQUEST FOR REHEARING - 2

Similarly, Appellant explained how the Examiner had failed to even plead a *prima facie* case of obviousness, because the Examiner had failed to show how each element of each of claims 3 to 66 (indeed, failed to show how each element of *any* claim) was taught by the art of record. See APPEAL BRIEF (27 April 2004) at, e.g., 12:15 to 13:2.

Summary

Appellant respectfully asks the Board to reconsider its decision on claims 3 to 66 and withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of Appellant by its attorneys,
PHARMACEUTICAL PATENT ATTORNEYS, LLC

/mark pohl/

Mark POHL, Reg. No. 35,325

55 Madison Avenue, 4th floor (P 4014)

Morristown, NJ 07960-7397 USA

26 December 2006

Direct: Mark.Pohl@LicensingLaw.com

☎ +1 (973) 984-0076

SD:\Diedre\09.911.024 Reharing.doc

REQUEST FOR REHEARING - 3